

**REMARKS**

This paper is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated February 8, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on May 8, 2006.

Claim 2 is cancelled from the Application.

Claims 1,6,7,10,12,14,16, and 20 are currently amended in the Application

Claims 1, 3-20 are pending in the Application.

**1. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-14, 17-20 under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Bartlett (US Patent No. 6,151,208) in view of Shimozu et al. (JP 04-317638A).

Claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 20 are currently amended in the Application to include clarifying language that the method and device are used for tracking hand gestures which include finger movements, and for detecting bone sounds which can include finger sounds for controlling an electronic device.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 with subject matter from Claim 2.

Bartlett teaches a wearable device for "... finger-free operation" (Bartlett Column 1, line 7). There is no suggestion of the use of fingers for input of gesture commands to a computing device in Bartlett. In addition, Bartlett does not disclose the use of bioacoustic signals.

Shimozu teaches the detection of bioacoustic vibration but does not suggest a wearable device that has hand gestures with finger movements as presented in Applicant's Application.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection as Applicant believes that the combination of the Bartlett and Shimozu do not teach all of the elements of the independent Claim 1.

Claims 3 and 5 -9 depend upon independent Claim 1, and therefore include all of

the limitations thereof. Since Applicant believes that independent Claim 1 is patentably distinct from Bartlett (US Patent No. 6,151,208) in view of Shimozu et al. (JP 04-317638A) Claims 3 and 5 -9 are patentably distinct from Bartlett (US Patent No. 6,151,208) in view of Shimozu et al. (JP 04-317638A) as well. Reconsideration of the rejection to the Claims in view of the remarks is respectfully requested. Applicant believes that no new subject matter has been added.

Independent Claim 10 has been amended to more clearly indicate that the gesture patterns include finger movements.

#### A. Minute Movements

Fingers are minute movements. Fingers are complex with at least 3 joints. Fingers move in very different vectors of movement as compared to a simple hand.

#### B. Multiplicity of joints and digits

There are significant distinctions between fingers and a "macro" hand only movement which does not account for digits and their jointing and the multiplicity of the joints and digits on each hand.

#### C. Different vectors of movement, bi-directionality between thumb and digit

Further the opposing thumb action with the fingers, a bi directional movement is not suggested by a hand gesture. Bi directional motion is a unique and important feature in distinguishing the applicant's invention from the cited art.

Reconsideration of amended claim 10 is requested based on these 3 distinctions.

Claims 11 and 13 depend upon independent Claim 10, and therefore include all of the limitations thereof. Since Applicant believes that independent Claim 10 is patentably distinct from Bartlett (US Patent No. 6,151,208) in view of Shimozu et al. (JP 04-317638A) Claims 11 and 13 are patentably distinct from Bartlett (US Patent No. 6,151,208) in view of Shimozu et al.

(JP 04-317638A) as well. Reconsideration of the rejection to the Claims in view of the remarks is respectfully requested. Applicant believes that no new subject matter has been added.

Independent Claim 14 has been amended to more clearly indicate that the gesture patterns include finger movements.

Claims 15 and 17-19 depend upon independent Claim 14, and therefore include all of the limitations thereof. Since Applicant believes that independent Claim 14 is patentably distinct from Bartlett (US Patent No. 6,151,208) in view of Shimozu et al. (JP 04-317638A) Claims 15 and 17-19 are patentably distinct from Bartlett (US Patent No. 6,151,208) in view of Shimozu et al. (JP 04-317638A) as well. Reconsideration of the rejection to the Claims in view of the remarks is respectfully requested. Applicant believes that no new subject matter has been added.

Independent Claim 20 has been amended to more clearly indicate that the gesture patterns include finger movements.

Applicant believes that independent Claim 20 is patentably distinct from Bartlett (US Patent No. 6,151,208) in view of Shimozu et al. (JP 04-317638A) because gesture patterns include finger movements. Reconsideration of the rejection to the Claim in view of the remarks is respectfully requested. Applicant believes that no new subject matter has been added.

The Office Action rejected Claim 2 under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Bartlett (US Patent No. 6,151,208) in view of Shimozu et al. (JP 04-317638A), and further in view of Gerrissen et al (US Patent No. 5,319,747).

Applicant has cancelled Claim 2. Reconsideration of the rejection to the Claim in view of the remarks is respectfully requested. Applicant believes that no new subject matter has been added.

The Office Action rejected Claims 4 and 12 under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Bartlett (US Patent No. 6,151,208) in view of Shimozu et al. (JP 04-317638A), and further in view of Bank (Pub No. US 2003/0048915 A1).

Bank does not fill the missing elements as required through the combination of Bartlett and Shimozu, concerning the acoustic sounds from the finger. A mastoid bone is not a finger and Bank does not suggest that the bone conducted sound can be bi-directionally manipulated, as hands with fingers are, for control of an electronic device.

Claims 4 and 12 depend upon independent Claims 1 and 10, and therefore include all of the limitations thereof. Since Applicant believes that independent Claim 1 and 10 are patentably distinct from Bartlett (US Patent No. 6,151,208) in view of Shimozu et al. (JP 04-317638A) Claims 4 and 12 are patentably distinct from Bartlett (US Patent No. 6,151,208) in view of Shimozu et al. (JP 04-317638A) in further view of Bank (Pub No. US 2003/0048915 A1) as well. Reconsideration of the rejection to the Claims in view of the remarks is respectfully requested. Applicant believes that no new subject matter has been added.

The Office Action rejected Claim 16 under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Bartlett (US Patent No. 6,151,208) in view of Shimozu et al. (JP 04-317638A), and further in view of Sears et al (US Pat No. 6,115,482).

Claims 16 depend upon independent Claim 14 and therefore include all of the limitations thereof. Since Applicant believes that independent Claim 14 is patentably distinct from Bartlett (US Patent No. 6,151,208) in view of Shimozu et al. (JP 04-317638A) Claims 4 and 12 are patentably distinct from Bartlett (US Patent No. 6,151,208) in view of Shimozu et al. (JP 04-317638A) in further view of Sears et al (US Pat No. 6,115,482) as well. Reconsideration of the rejection to the Claim in view of the remarks is respectfully requested. Applicant believes that no new subject matter has been added.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's time and attention to this matter. Applicants believe Claims as now provided are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. The Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's representatives (713.403.7411) if any questions concerning this Application arise.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/5/06



Wendy K. Buskop  
Patent Attorney  
Reg. No. 32,202

Please mail correspondence to:

The address associated with customer number 26652.

Mr. John Etchells  
AT&T Corp.  
Room 2A-207  
One AT&T Way  
Bedminster, NJ 07921

REST AVAILABLE COPY